

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response are submitted in reply to the Office Action dated January 23, 2008, in which the Examiner:

rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over European Patent Application Publication EP 1 085 484 A2 to Nozaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,470,233 to Fruchterman et al.; and

rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,905,437 to Kaiho et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections below. Claims 5, 6 and 11-13 are currently pending. Claim 5 is the only independent claim.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman. A claim rejection under § 103 is improper unless the prior art references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest *each* and *every* claim recitation.

Applicants' amended claim 5 recites a method of supporting a self-sustained moving comprising the steps of inputting physical disability information on and a destination of a user from a communication terminal, computing a guide route of an optimum sidewalk to a disability condition of the user according to the physical disability information based on the physical disability information inputted from the communication terminal and sidewalk data stored in a database, the sidewalk data correlating to the physical disability information, combining the computed guide route with a map data stored in the database to output it as an electronic map, the map data being constructed for a pedestrian, and displaying the electronic map showing the guide route on the communication terminal, wherein the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information to that of the user.

Nozaki does not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Applicants' amended claim 5. For example, Nozaki does not teach or suggest inputting

physical disability information on a user and computing a guide route of an optimum sidewalk to a disability condition of the user according to the physical disability information. Instead, Nozaki teaches inputting a user's sex, age and hobby so that a route passing through advertisers, registered in a database, may be set. (Nozaki, paragraph [0077]-[0078]). For example, a woman who loves clothes would be given a route passing through boutiques that are registered advertisers. (Nozaki, paragraph [0078]). Given the disclosure of Nozaki, a wheelchair-bound woman who loves clothes would be directed to the same store as a non-wheelchair-bound woman, even if the store were not handicapped accessible. Nozaki also does not teach or suggest that computing a pedestrian guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information to that of the user. Instead, Nozaki is only concerned with whether a store is registered on an advertisement provider database. (Nozaki, paragraph [0078]). Therefore, in the example above, even if thousands of women who love clothes had previously been directed to a specific boutique, they would cease to be directed to said boutique if the boutique failed to remain a registered advertiser. Thus, Nozaki's route computation does not teach anything about a preferential computation based on a plurality of users.

The foregoing reveals that Nozaki does not teach the computation of a guide route according to physical disability information input by a user or that preference is given to the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information to that of the user.

Fruchterman does not add to the teachings of Nozaki, at least in that Fruchterman also does not teach or suggest a method of supporting self-sustained moving wherein the step of computing the guide route of an optimum sidewalk to a disability condition of the user includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information to that of the user. Instead, Fruchterman teaches that a user can "let the Sextant software determine the *shortest* route between the points." (Fruchterman, col. 4, lines 48-54; emphasis added). Fruchterman further discloses that a single blind user may store *his or her own* route preferences (see, e.g., Fruchterman, col. 4, lines 16-54). However, Fruchterman does not teach or

suggest preferentially computing a guide route of an optimum sidewalk to a disability condition of the user, giving preference to sidewalks *other* blind users have passed, as recited by Applicants' amended claim 5. The Examiner erroneously asserts in the Office Action, that Fruchterman teaches this preferential computation by reciting a "global positioning system that helps a blind pedestrian navigate through a city." (Office Action, page 7). However, Fruchterman does not even appear to teach or suggest that its system would store, or have access to, information on routes taken by any *other* users having similar physical disability information to that of the user. Therefore, Fruchterman cannot overcome the deficiencies of Nozaki because it also does not teach or suggest computing a guide route of an optimum sidewalk by preferentially computing a sidewalk passed by a plurality of users having similar disability information to that of the user.

Thus, neither Nozaki nor Fruchterman, nor the combination thereof, teaches or suggests each and every recitation of Applicants' amended claim 5. For the above reasons, the combination of Nozaki and Fruchterman fails to teach a method of supporting self-sustained moving that precisely provide a high-safety pedestrian route as disclosed by the present invention.

Claim 6 depends directly from claim 5 and includes additional recitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 6 is improper for at least the reasons stated above in connection with amended claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman should be withdrawn and claims 5 and 6 passed to issue.

Regarding the rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman and further in view of Kaiho, claims 11-13 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended claim 5 and include additional recitations thereto. As stated above, neither Nozaki nor Fruchterman, nor the combination thereof, teaches or suggests each and every recitation of amended claim 5.

Kaiho, which is directed to an electrically driven wheelchair, does not add to the teachings of Nozaki and Fruchterman. In fact, Kaiho adds nothing to the discussion of self-sustained moving by computing a guide route, and therefore, cannot teach or suggest preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information to that of the user.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nozaki in view of Fruchterman in further view of Kaiho is improper for at least the reasons stated above, and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the current Amendment constitutes new matter.

As Applicants have traversed each and every rejection raised by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5, 6 and 11-13 be withdrawn, and claims 5, 6 and 11-13 be passed to issue.

Applicants believe no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any fees are deemed necessary, authorization is granted to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Marina F. Cunningham/
Marina F. Cunningham
Registration No. 38,419
Attorney for the Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290
Customer No.: 35301